

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated March 2, 2005, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, claim 1 is objected to on formal grounds. Moreover, claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,675,780 to Wendels. And claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wendels in view of U.S. 5,873,353 to Makita.

By the above amendments, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and all the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections in connection with claims 1, 4, and 5 are believed to have been overcome. No new matter has been added. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, and since claim 2 was only rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and that indefiniteness rejection is believed to have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is now patentable over the prior art. Claims 4 and 5 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated March 2, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1 and 3-5 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,  
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215  
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 8/2/05